

# UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

for the

Western District of North Carolina

|  |   |                            |
|--|---|----------------------------|
| United States of America                           | ) |                            |
| v.   | ) |                            |
| JONATHAN WAYNE WADE                                | ) | Case No: <u>3:95CR5-09</u> |
|  | ) | USM No: <u>11722-058</u>   |
| Date of Previous Judgment: <u>October 27, 1995</u> | ) | James S. Weidner, Jr.      |
| (Use Date of Last Amended Judgment if Applicable)  | ) | Defendant's Attorney       |

## Order Regarding Motion for Sentence Reduction Pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(2)

Upon motion of ☒ the defendant ☐ the Director of the Bureau of Prisons ☐ the court under 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(2) for a reduction in the term of imprisonment imposed based on a guideline sentencing range that has subsequently been lowered and made retroactive by the United States Sentencing Commission pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 994(u), and having considered such motion,

**IT IS ORDERED** that the motion is:

☒ **DENIED.** ☐ **GRANTED** and the defendant's previously imposed sentence of imprisonment (as reflected in the last judgment issued) of \_\_\_\_\_ months **is reduced to** \_\_\_\_\_.

### I. COURT DETERMINATION OF GUIDELINE RANGE (Prior to Any Departures)

|   |  |
|---|--|
| Previous Offense Level: <u>39</u>                           | Amended Offense Level: <u>37</u>                           |
| Criminal History Category: <u>VI</u>                        | Criminal History Category: <u>VI</u>                       |
| Previous Guideline Range: <u>Life</u> to <u>Life</u> months | Amended Guideline Range: <u>Life</u> to <u>Life</u> months |

### II. SENTENCE RELATIVE TO AMENDED GUIDELINE RANGE

- ☐ The reduced sentence is within the amended guideline range.
- ☐ The previous term of imprisonment imposed was less than the guideline range applicable to the defendant at the time of sentencing as a result of a departure or Rule 35 reduction, and the reduced sentence is comparably less than the amended guideline range.
- ☒ Other (explain): No reduction is authorized because Defendant's original sentence was "based on" a departure from the mandatory minimum sentence of Life and not on a sentencing range lowered by Amendment 706. See United States v. Hood, 556 F.3d 226 (4<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2009).


### III. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Except as provided above, all provisions of the judgment dated October 27, 1995 shall remain in effect.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Order Date: April 24, 2009

Effective Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
(if different from order date)

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Frank D. Whitney  
United States District Judge

